



1
2
3 PLEASANT GROVE CITY
4 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
5 February 12, 2015
6

7 **PRESENT:** Chair Eric Jensen, Commissioners Amy Cordon, Drew Armstrong, Lisa Coombs,
8 Scott Richards and Levi Adams
9

10 **STAFF:** Community Development Director Ken Young, City Planner Royce Davies, Planning
11 Tech Barbara Johnson, City Engineer Degan Lewis and NAB Chairperson Libby Flegal
12

13 The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.
14

15 Vice-Chair Jensen welcomed Commissioner Coombs as a full Planning Commissioner. Absent
16 from the meeting were Commissioners Malone, Yeates and Nelson.
17

18 **Commission Business:**
19

- 20
 - **Opening Remarks:** Commissioner Richards gave the opening remarks.
 - **Agenda Approval:**
23

24 Chair Jensen informed the Commission of an item to be added to the agenda since Commissioner
25 Malone resigned from the Planning Commission and Chair Jensen was promoted to Chair. A
26 new Vice-Chair also needed to be elected.
27

- 28
 - **MOTION:** Commissioner Adams moved to approve the written agenda
29 as public record, with an additional item to elect a new Planning
30 Commission Vice-Chair for 2015. Commissioner Coombs seconded the
31 motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion
32 carried.
33

34

- **Staff Reports:**

35

- 36
 - **MOTION:** Commissioner Richards moved to approve the Staff Reports
37 as part of the public record. Commissioner Adams seconded the motion.
38 The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.
39

- **Declaration of conflicts and abstentions from Commission Members:** There were none.

ITEM 1 - Elect a new Vice-Chair for the year 2015.

Community Development Director, Ken Young, presented copies of the Commission Bylaws 3.1.1 to the Commissioners and proceed to read them aloud. The laws state that if a Chair resigns or is unable to fulfill his position the Vice-Chair succeeds the office for the remainder of the term. If a Vice-Chair resigns from office, or succeeds to the Chair's office, a special election shall be held at the next Regular Meeting of the Commission to select a Vice-Chair to complete the term. Mr. Young reviewed the election process. Chair Jensen opened the floor for nominations.

MOTION: Commissioner Adams moved to nominate Drew Armstrong as Planning Commission Vice-Chair for 2015. Commissioner Cardon seconded the motion.

MOTION: Commissioner Coombs moved to close the nominations. Commissioner Richards seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.

A written vote was cast and Chair Jensen and Mr. Young tallied the votes.

Commissioner Drew Armstrong was elected as Planning Commission Vice-Chair for 2015.

MOTION: Commissioner Adams moved to close the elections. Commissioner Armstrong seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.

ITEM 2 - Public Hearing to consider the request of Reza Sanati for approval of an amendment to the City Code Section 10-11-D-2-D to allow caretaker quarters to occupy up to 10% of a building area occupied by a business where the business operations, equipment, or other resources that require 24-hour oversight in the CS (Commercial Sales) Zone. ****Continued to March 12, 2015.***

ITEM 3 - Public Hearing to consider the request of Ronald Brailsford for approval of a two-lot preliminary subdivision called Trail's End Plat B located at approximately 720 South Locust Avenue in the R1-8 (Single Family Residential) Zone, with a General Plan designation of High Density Residential. **SCRATCH GRAVEL NEIGHBORHOOD.**

City Planner, Royce Davies, presented the staff report and displayed the current plat of the subdivision. The applicant proposed that a two-lot subdivision be created at 720 South Locust Avenue. The property is part of a larger subdivision known as Trail's End Plat A, which was approved in 2000. Subdivision Plat B would involve the vacation of Lot 7 within that subdivision.

Mr. Davies gave an analysis of the proposal. As proposed, Lot 1 would meet all of the zoning requirements for the R1-8 Zone, but two issues arose with Lot 2. The first pertained to the lot

1 width. The Code defines the frontage of a corner lot as the side with the narrowest dimensions.
2 In the case of Lot 2 that side would be the one along Locust Avenue and is only is roughly 72
3 feet wide, whereas the zone requires a 95-foot width. This would have to be resolved by being
4 granted a variance before the applicant could move forward. There is also the option to amend
5 the Code. The second issue with Lot 2 revolved around the existing garage located in the back
6 corner of the lot. The current Code specifies that an accessory building located in a side yard
7 needs to be 10 feet from the property line. The location of the garage is on the proposed property
8 line. Staff included a condition in the staff report to either remove the garage or modify its
9 location so it meets the required setback.

10
11 Chair Jensen asked for an explanation of why the request came before the Planning Commission
12 before going to the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Young stated that in his review of the application,
13 it was his understanding that both properties would front Trail's End Court. However, only a
14 few days prior to tonight's meeting, Mr. Young came upon an obscure definition in the Code that
15 states that the corner lot front needs to be along the narrower side. Between the discovery of that
16 Code definition and the Planning Commission Meeting, Mr. Young came up with the options
17 previously stated. The error was on his part, not the applicant.

18
19 Commissioner Richards asked if there was any known precedent for the Code definition.
20 Mr. Davies and Mr. Young were not aware of any previous situations to explain the definition.
21 Commissioner Richards suggested that eventually this part of the Code be modified to something
22 more appropriate. City Engineer, Degan Lewis, was aware of two instances in the City where
23 the front door of a home does not face the defined front of the lot, which creates conflict if the
24 homeowner wants to build an addition.

25
26 Carl Brailsford, the applicant's brother, gave his address as 594 South Locust Avenue. He
27 thanked the Commission for their service to the community. Mr. Brailsford stated that the home
28 on the property has always faced Locust Avenue and that would not change regardless of where
29 the front of the lot is defined. The issue of seeking a variance only came to light recently, so
30 they had not had time to properly process the information. Mr. Brailsford expressed that their
31 main concern involves the existing garage, which was constructed of cinderblock around 1965.
32 He had an estimate done on the replacement value, which would cost \$50 per square foot to
33 move. The garage is 1,000 square feet, so it would cost the applicant a significant amount of
34 money to have it moved. The family would like to keep the garage where it is. Mr. Brailsford
35 was unclear about why the garage did not cause a zoning issue when the subdivision was created
36 in 2000 but was creating an issue with this application. The family hoped to move forward with
37 the application as soon as possible, and were concerned that the process of obtaining a variance
38 will be time consuming.

39
40 The applicant, Ronald Brailsford, presented photographs of the existing garage. There was
41 discussion regarding the garage that was inaudible on the recording.

42
43 At this point, the Commission and staff discussed possible recommendations or conditions that
44 could be included to help resolve the issues presented with Lot 2. It was determined that if an
45 amendment were requested, it would require a separate application process and public hearing.

1 The Commission desired to give the applicant options that would not require them to come back
2 to the Commission for further approval. Staff decided that the application should be reviewed by
3 the City Attorney and then sent to the Board of Adjustment for variances on the frontage and
4 garage, separately.

5
6 Chair Jensen opened the public hearing.

7
8 Mary Ellen Brailsford gave her address as 594 South Locust Avenue. She asked for clarification
9 on why the garage location created an issue now but did not when the subdivision was created.

10
11 Mr. Davies explained that the problems arose because the applicant is seeking to subdivide the
12 lot. The current lot, as it exists, is recognized legally as a proper lot, whether it meets current
13 code or not. Because the request is to divide and create an entirely new lot to the rear, the lot has
14 to comply with the current code. Mr. Davies admitted that he did not know why the lot was
15 approved the way it was originally, but the new lot must comply.

16
17 There were no further public comments. Chair Jensen closed the public hearing.

18
19 **MOTION:** Commissioner Armstrong moved that the Planning Commission approve
20 preliminary plat, known as Land's End Subdivision Plat B, and adopt the exhibits, conditions,
21 and findings contained in the staff report, as modified by the following:

- 22
23 1) All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements shall be met.
24
25 2) A variance for the lot shall be obtained from the Board of Adjustment for Lot 2 prior to
26 presenting the subdivision to the City Council.
27
28 3) A variance for the encroachment of the garage may also be obtained, or not be obtained,
29 from the Board of Adjustment prior to presenting the subdivision to the City Council. If
30 the variance for the encroachment is not obtained, the garage must be removed or
31 modified to meet current Code requirements.
32
33 4) The City Attorney shall review this prior to presenting the application to the Board of
34 Adjustment.

35
36 Commissioner Richards seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye".
37 The motion carried.

38
39 **Review and approve the Minutes and Report of Actions from the following meetings:**
40 **Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for January 8, 2015.**

41
42 **MOTION:** Commissioner Richards moved to approve the Minutes of January 8, 2015.
43 Commissioner Coombs seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye".
44 The motion carried.

1 **Item 4** Review and discussion of Pleasant Grove City General Plan Goals.

2
3 With no further Public Hearing items, Chair Jensen invited any residents who desired to hear the
4 Review and Discussion to stay. All others were excused.
5

6 Mr. Young presented copies of the goals for the first three chapters of the General Plan and
7 suggested that if any of the Commission Members are unfamiliar with the goals, that they take
8 time to study the General Plan, which is available online. The City views the goals as the
9 skeleton or the bones to the body of the plan and they strive to keep them up-to-date. He also
10 stated that Chapters 1 and 2 of the Plan have recently been reviewed, amended, and approved.
11

12 Mr. Young read through each goal, asking the Commission to address anything they have
13 questions or concerns with.
14

15 The first major discussion revolved around Goal 2.A.ii and the R/UDAT (Rural/Urban Design
16 Assistance Team) reports. In 2006, Pleasant Grove City was chosen to participate in the study,
17 and they were presented with a report, which was a comprehensive review of the needs and
18 analysis of the Downtown and Grove areas. The report was also available online. Mr. Young
19 stated that a lot of good has been done through R/UDAT. The concern from the Commission
20 was that the document is nearly nine years old and the majority of the Commission and staff
21 were not in office when the study was conducted. It was determined that the report and goals
22 should be reviewed to ensure that they are still applicable to the City. Staff recommended that
23 the Planning Commission review the report prior to the next meeting. In the meantime, staff
24 would prepare a public presentation.
25

26 There was discussion regarding accessory apartments and the proposed text amendment. Staff
27 agreed to make a presentation on some of the issues pertaining to this text amendment at the
28 March 24, 2015, Planning Commission Meeting.
29

30 It was recommended that the Commission and staff delay the review of Chapter 3 until the
31 R/UDAT is reviewed. Mr. Young requested that before the next discussion of the General Plan
32 Goals, the Commissioners research the seven commercial districts outlined in Chapter 2.
33

34 Through discussion, it was determined that a second Planning Commission Meeting should be
35 held every month, on the fourth Thursday, starting February 2015. The meeting would be held
36 primarily for ordinance and General Plan review.
37

38 Before ending the discussion, Commissioner Richards requested a history of each of the
39 neighborhoods in the City so that the Commission will have a more knowledge upon which to
40 base their decisions.
41

42 Chair Jensen thanked the Commission and public for attending the meeting.
43

44 **MOTION:** Commissioner Coombs moved to adjourn. Commissioner Armstrong seconded the
45 motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.

1
2 The meeting adjourned at 8:13 p.m.
3
4

5 _____
6 Planning Commission Chair
7

8 _____
9 Barbara Johnson, Planning Tech
10

11 _____
12 Date Approved
13
14 _____
